that his intention at the time that the present application was filed, and his intention at the time that his priority Japanese application was filed, was that the same intensity values calculated in step S7 remain the same for each necessary repetition of the loop defined by steps S4-S7. Applicant respectfully further urges his position based upon the arguments following below. Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner's consideration of these further arguments.

Applicant's Response of January 9, 2002 (to Paper No. 14) discusses at length the surface potential drift phenomenon. In Paper No. 16, the Examiner expressed agreement that the photoreceptor surface potential drift is a well-known phenomenon. (Paper No. 16, page 4, typed lines 6-9) As such, no further discussion of the phenomenon is considered necessary at this point.

Applicant and the undersigned believe that the Examiner is in full agreement with the statement that the five fine laser intensity values such as those set forth on page 12, lines 9-11 of Applicant's specification are calculated when processing first advances to step S7 of Applicant's claimed method. At issue is whether those of ordinary skill in the art would understand that these exemplary fine laser intensity values are ever re-calculated in subsequent processing through the loop defined by steps S4-S7. As the Examiner acknowledges, Applicant's answer to this question is no. In addition to the reasons for his answer that Applicant has given in previous communications to the U.S. Patent Office, the Applicant herein states further reasons why those of ordinary skill in the art would understand his disclosure as teaching that any subsequent iterations of loop S4-S7 would be done without re-calculating the fine intensity values.

The five fine exemplary intensity values given at page 12, lines 9-11 of the specification, differ by only a value of $P_{MAX}$ x (2/1023). The step values are $P_{MAX}$ x (950/1023), $P_{MAX}$ x (952/1023), $P_{MAX}$ x (954/1023), $P_{MAX}$ x (956/1023) and $P_{MAX}$ x (958/1023). According to Applicant, those of ordinary skill in the art, familiar with the phenomenon of photoreceptor potential drift, would understand that the difference in actual residual potential of the photoreceptor, resulting from exposure at each of these very small interval steps, likewise is very small. Those of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would be of no further utility to further divide each of the fine intensity values, that is further divide the already small interval of $P_{MAX}$ x (2/1023). Those of ordinary skill would conclude that the different observed residual potentials for the photoreceptor, as measured after a further division of the fine interval intensities given at page 12, lines 9-11 of the specification, would be essentially meaningless in obtaining an optimal value for the maximum laser intensity. This is because those of ordinary skill in the art would contemplate that detection error in detecting the surface potential, and slight positional differences at each exposure would make such measurement results meaningless for further divided fine laser intensity values. For these primary reasons, Applicant courteously solicits the Examiner's reconsideration of his current position so as to come into agreement with Applicant as to how one of ordinary skill in the art would comprehend the teaching of his disclosure.

Applicant also points out that, in practice, repetition of the loop of steps S4-S7 usually is not necessary. Applicant's experience is that the surface potential drift of the photoreceptor typically occurs within the interval of $P_{MAX}$ x (20/1023). This interval

step is set in step S3 of Applicant's Figure 1. Thereafter, once processing has proceeded through step S3 and enters the first iteration of loop steps S4-S7, and the fine laser intensity values are set the first time, the interval will be sufficiently small in order to obtain the desired target optimal value. When an unusual surface potential drift occurs, this is when further repetition of loop S4-S7 becomes necessary.

In view of the foregoing comments, Applicant courteously submits that the current rejection of claims 1-5 under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 has been overcome. Withdrawal of this rejection is solicited. Also, Applicant wishes to express his appreciation for the Examiner's withdrawal of the prior rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph which was made in Paper No. 16. Favorable action with respect to this application in accordance with the above courteously is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

Michael A. Makuch, Reg. 32,263
1850 M Street, NW – Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone : 202/263-4300
Facsimile : 202/263-4329

Date : June 18, 2002

182603w